2012–2013 Great Start Readiness Program

Program Quality Assessment

Statewide Data Report

Prepared by

The Center for Early Education Evaluation at HighScope

September 2013

Updated February 2014

Prepared for

Michigan Department of Education

Introduction

The following report summarizes Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) classroom quality data collected during the 2012–2013 program year. The data was reported and scored using the preschool version of HighScope's OnlinePQA[1] (Program Quality Assessment) system. The data was requested from Red-e Set Grow on July 30th 2013 and sent on Aug 2nd 2013. For Form A reports, this data was collected by individuals other than classroom teachers (e.g., early childhood specialists). For Form B reports, the data was collected by administrators (e.g., program directors). This report covers only the end-of-year data from Forms A and B. Scores on the Preschool Program Quality Assessment (PQA) range from 1 to 5, with 1 representing low quality and 5 representing high quality. PQA scores can be interpreted at two levels—item level and summary level. At the item level, 1 is low quality, 3 is medium quality, and 5 is high quality. At the summary level, item scores in each section are added together to create an average section score. Section scores are then added together to obtain overall mean scores. A useful way to interpret overall mean scores is using a cut-off at each half point, thus yielding 5 quality levels across the continuum. Overall mean score ranges are from 1.00-1.49 at the lowest level, to 4.50-5.00 at the highest level. The second level is from 1.50-2.49, the third from 2.50–3.49 and the fourth from 3.50–4.49. These levels can be used to interpret both Form A and Form B results at the summary level only.

Those collecting PQA data are initially required to attend a four-week online preschool PQA training course or a face-to-face training and pass a reliability assessment with a score of 80 percent or higher in each of ten sections and an overall reliability score of 80 percent or higher prior to observing in GSRP classrooms. Those who continue to collect data from year to year are required to recertify annually by successfully passing a reliability assessment.

Mean PQA scores for the 2011–12 and 2012–13 program years, shown in Table 1, are based on data collected by trained individuals other than classroom teachers for both program years. These scores show that, on average, one area of implementation meets the 5th quality level (parent involvement and family services) and that all other areas, on average, fall within the 4th quality level. Additionally, there are notable changes between these two time periods; for example, a 3.49 percent increase in scores overall for the learning environment and a 2.22 percent increase in the average score for daily routine. However, there is almost no change for all Form B sections. Some caution should be used when reviewing the data and interpreting the changes between the two time periods.

---

[1] HighScope Educational Research Foundation & Red-e Set Grow. (2012). *OnlinePQA* [Computerized assessment system]. Online at http://www.onlinepqa.net.

The number of classrooms (*N* =777) for the 2011–12 transition year is much lower than the current year (*N*=1042) and therefore may not fully represent overall program scores for that year.

In PQA reports for previous years, data has been further analyzed by splitting it by service type (e.g., school-day, all-day/alternate-day, part-day) and grantee type (e.g., formula and competitive). This data was not available in the OnlinePQA system; therefore, subsequent PQA data in this report will not be divided by service type or grantee type.

Table 1: PQA Mean Scores and Change 2011–12 vs. 2012–13

PQA Scale	2011–12 Mean Score	2012–13 Mean Score	Change	% Change
Classroom Level (Form A)	***N*=777**	***N*=1042**		
Total Score for Form A	**4.12**	**4.20**	**0.08**	**1.94**
I. Learning Environment	4.01	4.15	0.14	3.49
II. Daily Routine	4.06	4.15	0.09	2.22
III. Adult-Child Interaction	4.18	4.23	0.05	1.20
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment	4.35	4.37	0.02	0.46
Center Level (Form B)	***N*=319**	***N*=392**		
Total Score for Form B	**4.37**	**4.35**	**-0.02**	**-0.46**
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services	4.53	4.50	-0.03	-0.66
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development	4.03	4.02	-0.01	-0.25
VII. Program Management	4.46	4.47	0.01	.22

Table 2 shows the PQA score distribution for GSRP. As shown, GSRP classrooms are on the higher end of the quality rating continuum. The distribution is depicted as percentages of classrooms at five quality levels. On Form A, most classrooms, i.e., 55.9 percent fall within the 4th quality level. However, approximately 90 percent of the classrooms had overall scores within the two highest levels (a score of 3.5 or higher). For Form B, more than 95 percent scored within the two highest ranges. On both Form A and B, 1 percent or less of classrooms fell within the lowest two levels across all sections.

Table 2: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Scale

PQA Scale	Level of Quality (%)				
	Mean Scores 1.00-1.49	Mean Scores 1.50-2.49	Mean Scores 2.50–3.49	Mean Scores 3.50–4.49	Mean Scores 4.50- 5.00
Classroom Level (Form A)					
Total Score for Form A	**0.0**	**0.1**	**9.7**	**55.9**	**34.2**
I. Learning Environment	0.0	0.3	12.6	57.5	29.6
II. Daily Routine	0.0	0.8	14.5	47.8	36.9
III. Adult-Child Interaction	0.0	0.8	10.4	47.1	41.7
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment	0.0	0.9	7.4	42.1	49.6
Center Level (Form B)					
Total Score for Form B	**0.0**	**0.0**	**3.1**	**59.0**	**37.9**
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services	0.0	0.0	2.1	37.4	60.5
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development	0.0	1.0	17.0	62.1	19.8
VII. Program Management	0.0	0.0	3.1	41.3	55.6

Areas In Need of Improvement

Table 3 provides information at the item level at three different thresholds that can be used to identify areas in need of improvement. The first is the percentage of classrooms at an unacceptable level of quality (scores of 1 or 2) for a particular item. The second is the percentage of classrooms scoring at an acceptable level of quality (score of 3), and the third threshold is classrooms scoring at a good level of quality (scores of 4 or 5). The bolded areas show percentages 10 percent or greater at the unacceptable level. At the acceptable level, percentages of 25 percent or greater have been bolded.

Table 3: Distribution of Quality Level by PQA Item

PQA Item	Level of Quality (%)		
	Level 1 & 2	Level 3	Level 4 & 5
Form A			
I. Learning Environment			
A. Safe and healthy environment	3.5	7.1	89.4
B. Defined interest areas	3.2	18.0	78.8
C. Logically located interest areas	1.6	19.4	79.0
D. Outdoor space, equipment, materials	5.1	5.5	89.4
E. Organization and labeling of materials	4.2	**27.6**	68.1
F. Varied and open-ended materials	2.7	19.7	77.6
G. Plentiful materials	1.2	12.1	86.7
H. Diversity-related materials	7.1	**49.0**	44.0
I. Displays of child initiated work	8.7	**35.8**	55.5
II. Daily Routine			
A. Consistent daily routine	1.8	14.9	83.2
B. Parts of the day	0.9	10.4	88.7
C. Appropriate time for each part of day	2.9	17.7	79.4
D. Time for child planning	8.6	**32.9**	58.5
E. Time for child-initiated activities	0.7	14.1	85.2
F. Time for child recall	**10.6**	**30.0**	59.3
G. Small-group time	**21.4**	6.3	72.3
H. Large-group time	8.2	24.1	67.7
I. Choices during transition times	**13.4**	**29.9**	56.7
J. Cleanup time with reasonable choices	3.0	10.8	86.2
K. Snack or mealtime	8.6	9.6	81.8
L. Outside time	7.9	13.7	78.3
III. Adult-Child Interaction			
A. Meeting basic physical needs	3.2	2.5	94.3
B. Handling separation from home	2.0	8.7	89.3
C. Warm and caring atmosphere	1.1	5.5	93.4
D. Support for child communication	2.6	24.2	73.2
E. Support for non-English speakers	3.2	14.5	82.3
F. Adults as partners in play	3.7	**30.3**	66.0
G. Encouragement of child initiatives	1.4	20.2	78.4
H. Support for child learning at group times	6.8	**27.0**	66.2
I. Opportunities for child exploration	4.2	**26.4**	69.4
J. Acknowledgement of child efforts	9.5	**28.4**	62.1
K. Encouragement for peer interaction	1.4	19.3	79.4
L. Independent problem solving	1.4	13.6	85.0
M. Conflict resolution	8.9	**41.9**	49.2

PQA Item	Level 1 & 2	Level 3	Level 4 & 5
IV. Curriculum Planning and Assessment			
A. Curriculum model	6.4	9.4	84.3
B. Team teaching	**11.9**	**27.6**	60.5
C. Comprehensive child records	0.3	3.1	96.6
D. Anecdotal note taking by staff	8.5	18.0	73.5
E. Use of child observation measure	2.3	4.8	92.9
Form B			
V. Parent Involvement and Family Services			
A. Opportunities for involvement	0.3	9.4	90.3
B. Parents on policy-making committees	**16.8**	**35.1**	48.2
C. Parent participation in child activities	0.0	2.1	97.9
D. Sharing of curriculum information	1.8	18.4	79.7
E. Staff-parent informal interactions	0.0	2.9	97.1
F. Extending learning at home	0.5	18.8	80.7
G. Formal meetings with parents	2.3	1.3	96.4
H. Diagnostic/special education services	0.5	1.8	97.7
I. Service referrals as needed	2.6	**28.3**	69.1
J. Transition to kindergarten	0.5	12.5	87.0
VI. Staff Qualifications and Development			
A. Program director background	**29.5**	10.4	60.1
B. Instructional staff background	8.1	6.3	85.7
C. Support staff orientation and supervision	1.6	7.7	90.7
D. Ongoing professional development	5.0	13.8	81.2
E. In-service training content and methods	6.5	17.0	76.5
F. Observation and feedback	4.4	8.9	86.7
G. Professional organization affiliation	**44.4**	22.8	32.8
VII. Program Management			
A. Program licensed	0.3	0.3	99.5
B. Continuity in instructional staff	**14.4**	0.5	85.1
C. Program assessment	2.3	6.0	91.7
D. Recruitment and enrollment plan	6.8	12.0	81.2
E. Operating policies and procedures	8.6	0.8	90.6
F. Accessibility for those with disabilities	5.2	1.3	93.5
G. Adequacy of program funding	6.8	**30.5**	62.7

Characteristics of GSRP Teaching Staff

The most up-to-date information on teacher credentialing status for GSRP teaching staff was received from Michigan Department of Education (MDE) on Oct 17th 2013, and supplemental information to identify teachers working for a local education agency (LEA) or non-LEA program was received on Feb 7th 2014. For credentialing status, in Table 4 a majority of formula and competitive lead and associate teachers met the credentialing criteria within their program type (program type was available for credentialing status and therefore the data is presented by type). Overall, most lead teachers met their credential requirement (94.5 percent formula LEA, 96.7 percent formula non-LEA and 97.3 percent competitive, respectively). For associate teachers 85.3 percent formula LEA, 92.3 percent formula non-LEA, and 91.8 percent competitive met their credential requirement. In previous PQA reports, the highest level of teacher education has also been reported. However, there was no additional information beyond that reported in Table 4 for teacher education.

Table 4: Teacher Credential Status

Type of Teacher	Credential Status	Formula		Competitive	Total
		LEA	Non-LEA		
Lead	**Total N**	**1006**	**90**	**148**	**1244**
	N meeting qualification[a]	**951**	**87**	**144**	
	% meeting qualification	**94.5%**	**96.7%**	**97.3%**	
	N with compliance plan	**23**	**3**	**4**	
	N without compliance plan	**32**	**0**	**0**	
	Teaching certificate with ZA/ZS	<u>947</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>69</u>	
	Teaching certificate with CDA	14	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	
	BA(ECE/CD) with prek training	18	<u>10</u>	<u>67</u>	
	Teaching certificate with approval	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	
	Teaching certificate within 1-2 courses for ZA	23	3	4	
Associate	**Total N**	**980**	**91**	**147**	**1218**
	N meeting qualification[a]	**836**	**84**	**135**	
	% meeting qualification	**85.3%**	**92.3%**	**91.8%**	
	N with compliance plan	**100**	**3**	**7**	
	N without compliance plan	**44**	**4**	**5**	
	AA or higher in ECE/CD	<u>302</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>61</u>	
	CDA	<u>339</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>66</u>	
	120 hours approval from MDE	<u>195</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	
	Teaching certificate with compliance plan	8	0	2	
	Other AA/BA/BS with compliance plan	7	0	1	
	Minimal qualification with compliance plan	85	3	4	
	No compliance plan (teaching cert./other AA/BA/BS)	44	4	5	

Note. [a]The underlined numbers indicate the qualification was met. Lead teachers from formula local education agency (LEA) programs are coded as qualified if they had a MI teaching certificate with a ZA/ZS or a MI teaching certificate with PPI/Special Education approval. Lead teachers from a non-LEA and all lead teachers from competitive programs are coded as qualified if they checked one of the first 4 categories listed above. All lead teachers with a MI teaching certificate within 1-2 courses of a ZA are coded as having a compliance plan. Lead teachers who are neither qualified, nor have a compliance plan are coded as having no compliance plan (i.e., teachers from a formula LEA program who only had a teaching certificate with a CDA or BA in child development). Associate teachers with one of the first 3 credentials are considered to be qualified. Associate teachers who only checked teaching certificate or other AA or BA/BS, were examined as to whether they provided course information about a compliance plan. Those who noted a ZA, CDA or approval by MDE were coded as qualified; those who provided information on early childhood education/child development course were coded as unqualified but with a compliance plan; and those who did not provide course information in early childhood education/child development were coded as unqualified with no compliance plan.

Information on teacher compensation and benefits was downloaded from the Michigan Electronic Grants System (MEGS) from the Staff Report for Center Based Classrooms on August 9, 2013. Table 5 shows that approximately 90 percent of teachers (93.3 percent for lead teachers and 91.2 percent for associate teachers) have one year or more of GSRP teaching experience and about half of the teachers have union contract coverage (52.9 percent for lead teachers and 45.3 percent for associate teachers).

Table 5: Teacher Experience and Contract Coverage

	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
Teacher Characteristics	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**
GSRP Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	6.7	79	8.8	102
1 to 2 years	36.7	433	36.2	422
3 to 4 years	15.3	181	13.2	154
4 to 5 years	7.5	89	8.0	93
More than 5 years	33.8	400	33.8	394
Additional Teaching Experience				
Less than 1 year	32.8	388	36.7	427
1 to 2 years	23.9	281	16.3	191
3 to 4 years	13.0	154	12.4	144
4 to 5 years	7.4	88	5.4	63
More than 5 years	22.9	271	29.2	340
Contract Coverage				
Yes	52.9	626	45.3	531
No	47.1	557	54.7	641

Table 6 contains compensation information for all lead and associate teachers. Lead teachers, on average, make approximately $7.80 more per hour than associate teachers, and salaried positions pay approximately $25,000 more per year. Most teachers work between 32 and 36 hours per week, 38 weeks per year. Most teachers also receive some additional benefits (mean total for lead teachers is 5.08 and for associate teachers 3.86). In addition to describing teacher compensation, a test for statistically significant differences in compensation by program type was conducted. As indicated in Table 7, lead teachers in formula grant programs make significantly higher hourly wages and annual salaries than their competitive grant program counterparts. Their hourly rate is $2.90 more per hour than competitive grant programs. Annual salary averages are also significantly more per year for formula grant program lead teachers than for competitive grant teachers ($10,500 more

per year). Also associate teachers in competitive grant programs on average make a significantly higher annual salary than do formula grant teachers ($6,652 more per year). As for hourly rates for associate teachers, both grant program types make about the same amount ($11.97 for formula grantees vs. $11.80 for competitive grantees). Finally, Table 8 shows the prevalence of the types of benefits staff receive.

Table 6: Teacher Compensation

Type of Compensation	Lead Teacher			Associate Teacher		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Hourly salary	19.77	5.89	403	11.94	2.08	972
Annual salary	43,817	16,231	777	18,459	7,903	191
Hours worked per week	35.60	6.19	1180	32.98	6.79	1168
Weeks worked per year	37.91	4.60	1183	37.25	4.44	1169
Total number of benefits received	5.08	2.42	1183	3.86	2.67	1173

Table 7: Teacher Compensation by Program Type

Type of Compensation	Formula Grantee		Competitive Grantee	
	Mean	N	Mean	N
Lead Teacher				
Hourly salary***	20.26	316	17.36	62
Annual salary***	44,434	729	33,934	37
Associate Teacher				
Hourly salary	11.97	864	11.80	79
Annual salary***	17,273	164	23,925	20

Note. * $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

<h3 style="text-align:center">**Table 8: Teacher Benefits**</h3>

Benefits Received	Lead Teacher		Associate Teacher	
	%	**N**	**%**	**N**
Health insurance				
Yes	73.1	865	44.7	524
No	26.9	318	55.3	649
Dental insurance				
Yes	70.6	835	44.4	521
No	29.4	348	55.6	652
Vision insurance				
Yes	66.3	784	43.6	511
No	33.7	399	56.4	662
Disability insurance				
Yes	44.4	525	31.1	365
No	55.6	658	68.9	808
Vacation days				
Yes	40.9	484	37.6	441
No	59.1	699	62.4	732
Sick days				
Yes	89.7	1061	81.8	959
No	10.3	122	18.2	214
Retirement				
Yes	76.9	910	67.6	793
No	23.1	273	32.4	380
Tax annuity				
Yes	14.7	174	9.0	106
No	85.3	1009	91.0	1067
Dependent care				
Yes	11.7	139	8.4	99
No	88.3	1044	91.6	1074
Cafeteria benefits				
Yes	13.9	164	11.8	139
No	86.1	1019	88.2	1034
Other benefits				
Yes	5.7	68	5.6	66
No	94.3	1115	94.4	1107